

USEPA AMCO Superfund Site CAG Meeting, December 13, 2010

Attendees

EPA:	Rose Marie Caraway Leana Rosetti Steve Calanog
EPA Contractors:	Kent Baugh/ITSI Yash Nyznyk/CDM
CAG Members:	Monsa Nitoto John Schweizer Kathy Cheung Ellen Wyrick Parkinson Brian Beveridge Eric Gerrick Tony Diamantidis Nick Robinson Eric Maundu Vic Johnson Bruce Beasley Gary Fracchia Kerri Atwood Frances Watson Kathy Webster

Purpose of Meeting

- *Review CAG structure and procedures, including vote on proposed CAG procedures from last meeting.*
- *Update on West Oakland Lead Cleanup, including discussions with local schools and organizations for student involvement and community involvement and local contracting.*
- *Update regarding AMCO field sampling activities.*
- *Planning related to development of the Proposed Plan, including tentative timeline for Proposed Plan workshop and Public Meeting.*
- *Input from Technical Advisor.*

Welcome & Introductions

Brian Beveridge, Community Co-Chair, and Leana Rosetti, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC) and EPA Co-Chair

- Co-Chair Beveridge and EPA Co-Chair Rosetti opened the meeting

Review CAG Structure

Co-Chair Beveridge, and EPA Co-Chair Rosetti reviewed CAG Structure

For more information, refer to EPA handout regarding CAG Structure at Bay Harbor Cement Kiln Dust Site, Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Operating Procedures.

- Co-Chair Rosetti -- Passed out an example Operating Procedures that had been generated by a community group established at another Superfund Site project (Bay Harbor Cement Kiln Dust Site Regional Stakeholder Group)

- Co-Chair Beveridge – to date, the AMCO CAG group has been somewhat informal; consideration is to look at the approach that other groups have taken
- CAG group serves as an advisory group to EPA on issues within the community and decisions that EPA makes on the Superfund Site.

Questions and Responses

- If we establish a defined structure, there is a concern that we could be limiting ourselves.
- Is there a need to have a formal membership (e.g., is there a need for formal vote on any issues)?
- Who sets the agenda for the CAG meetings? The direction and issues are to be defined by the Community. EPA is available to assist, respond to questions, and provide technical information related to the investigation and remediation of the AMCO Facility.
- B. Beveridge stated that the CAG should “own” the process. Part of what we must do is to have the experts help identify when the CAG can advise on decisions.
- Communication with the Community: A Facebook site has been developed by EPA. There is e-mail communication (e.g., providing agenda prior to the upcoming CAG meeting).
- Rather than having to go to a meeting to learn about the decision-point, is there a way of informing folks when it is time to make a decision on something?
 - **EPA:** EPA is required to get public comment at a specific time to address a specific issue. For the upcoming Proposed Plan meeting, EPA will advertise in the newspaper, etc., to inform the public about the time, date, and location for the public meeting. For the Proposed Plan meeting, a court stenographer will be present to record comments from the community.
- Will there ever be a vote or motion from the CAG members on decisions to be made at the AMCO Site? It seems that the best way to provide input is during the Public Comment Period on the Proposed Plan.
- B. Beveridge suggested that the Group think about whether the CAG should change what they do and how they provide input to EPA. This issue can be discussed further at future meetings.
- At the CAG meetings, you have folks who consistently participate in meetings and folks who come to meeting periodically. It is important to avoid the situation where the folks who don't come to meetings consistently (and, therefore, aren't familiar with information/developments that have occurred) dominate discussions at a meeting with questions that have been answered previously. Responding to issues/questions from these folks has the potential to bog down progress at the CAG meetings. The chair should have the power to refer meeting participants to existing documents or to talk to EPA directly in a “side-meeting” or at the conclusion of the CAG meeting.
- It was suggested that the Chair make an announcement about the need for efficiency in conducting the meetings – refer folks to existing documents and references as sources of information.
- It was suggested that EPA create a standard board that contains a listing of information sources (web sites, contacts, etc.).
- It was suggested that there be some structure in the CAG “to give more weight” in decision-making to folks who tend to be here more frequently. Sign in sheets should have a running list of regular attendees so that they can just check their name.
- It was suggested that EPA provide a listing of when/what kind of input the community should make and when/how this input can be most useful and effective.
- It was suggested that the community be shown a sample Proposed Plan and be given as much help and preparation with understanding it as possible.
EPA: There will be a workshop regarding the Proposed Plan for precisely this purpose, and it's up to the CAG what they'd like this workshop to look like.
- **Agreements**
 1. Co-Chairs will defer questions that have already been covered in prior meetings.
 2. Regular CAG member attendees will be listed on the sign-up sheet.

3. Information sources will be posted on a board at every meeting.
 4. Draft meeting agendas will be discussed at the end of every meeting. The draft agendas will be e-mailed to the community members 2 weeks prior to the to the next CAG meeting. Input from the Community will be solicited.
- EPA announced they had purchased a new sign for the AMCO site (message board). EPA announced that they are looking for someone to install the message board (opportunity to hire a local contractor to install).

West Oakland Lead Cleanup

EPA - Steve Calanog presented an update regarding the West Oakland Residential Lead Project

- S. Calanog indicated that the laboratory treatability studies are ongoing.
- J. Schweizer recently visited the EPA testing laboratory.
- Overall summary – S. Calanog believes that the early data are encouraging. These data indicate that they are able to reduce the toxic lead levels in soil with the calcium phosphate treatment.
- During the past couple of weeks, he has been trying to figure out ways to utilize local hiring. During discussions with a nearby contractor, the contractor had indicated that they are able to hire local staff to perform a number of the soil stabilization activities.
- EPA also intends to put out a number of small contracts for activities such as film documentation, public information, etc. and has already requested bids.
- During the Open House meeting, S. Calanog was approached by two school teachers asking about how the project can utilize students (part-time to help out with non-cleanup work) and whether there were intern positions available. It was suggested that attempts be made to partner with local schools such as McClymonds High School.
- It was suggested that EPA work with non-profit organizations to perform some activities (e.g., film documentation of the work).
- A toxicology student at Cal Berkeley offered to help out in some way.
- In order to work on the project, there would likely be requirements for certain types of training; credentials. It was suggested that the required training should be provided to the community.

Questions and Responses

- It was suggested that EPA needs to get information out to the Community about job opportunities. It was suggested that EPA advertise on local radio stations (I-TALK); or local newspapers (e.g., Oakland Tribune, Oakland Post); or try to get the word out through word-of-mouth communication.

Additional Issues of Concern to Community Members related to the Lead Cleanup Program (issues raised near end of the meeting):

- What is the specific schedule for the lead project? Some people have very busy travel/work schedules and need a lot of lead time to make plans.
- How is the process going to work? Need better understanding of the process.
- What is the timeline for the work to be done (timing, what time does it stop)?
- Do we need to be at home?
- Do we put plastic on the windows?
- What type of landscaping options will be available? How much time will we have to decide what we want and consider different landscaping options? People don't want to be rushed.
- What kind of materials will be used?

- One resident has trees in boxes, ready for planting, but not able to plant until after the lead project. He wants the timing of implementation of the project to make sense (i.e., seasons are important). He is concerned about losing the trees.

AMCO Field Sampling Activities

EPA – Rose Marie Caraway, EPA RPM presented an update of the recent and planned field sampling activities at the AMCO Chemical Superfund Site, including the CPT/MIP investigation program (ongoing) and the aquifer testing (planned).

For more information, refer to the EPA HHRA handouts.

- The Cone Penetrometer Test (CPT)/Membrane Interface Probe (MIP). The CPT/MIP field investigation program was initiated at the end of November.
- The technology allows us to push through the soil and gather information on the nature of the geologic materials. We can also qualitatively determine the concentrations of the volatile contaminants using the MIP.
- We have found that the CPT/MIP rig is not able to get to the target depths (are not able to get through the sand/gravel formation). We may have to use a normal rig to collect samples within the source area to determine the most appropriate depth of excavation.
- Likely will use a drill rig to drill down to the target depths and collect samples; data from this effort (concentrations between depths of 8 and 15 feet) will be useful in determining the target depth of excavation in the source area.

Proposed Plan – Interim Remedial Action

EPA – Rose Marie Caraway, EPA RPM, discussed the schedule and process related to the Proposed Plan. For more information, refer to the EPA HHRA handouts.

- Focused Feasibility Study (FFS) Report – EPA has completed the internal draft version of the FFS Report. The report is currently being reviewed by EPA and has been sent to the State for their review. Regarding State review, we don't know the timeframe for getting review comments back. The schedule assumes comments back from the State before the end of January.
- Contents of the Draft FFS:
 1. Common Elements – excavation of soil in Phases 1 and 2 (depth of about 5 feet)
 2. In addition to the No Action alternative, there are 2 remedial action alternatives. The primary difference between the current Alternatives 2 and 3 has to do with property ownership at the completion of the remedial action. Rather than City of Oakland ownership (Alternative 2), another option is to have the current residential property owners retain ownership at the completion of the remedial action (Alternative 3).
 3. Alternatives – Source area remediation involved excavation of impacted soils to a depth of 15 feet. This will require shoring (placement of engineering controls to make sure the hole stays open during the excavation) to a depth of 65 feet. The overall cost for this is high, so we are going to look at adding another alternative. The new alternative will consist of excavation in the source area to a depth of 8 feet (rather than 15 feet).
 4. Shoring: In order to excavate to a depth below the water table, a significant depth of shoring (to 65 feet) will be needed. Shoring will influence the amount of water that we would have to deal with during excavation and also, would help to stabilize soils during excavation. There is the potential for vibration and impact to homes. EPA is aware of this potential and will address during the design phase of the project. The intent is to make the community aware of potential impacts.
 5. With a more shallow excavation, will not have to use shoring to a depth of 65 feet.
 6. Another element of the new alternative is to look at treatment of lead in several of the areas of excavation in a manner consistent with the community Lead Cleanup program (i.e., stabilization of lead in the soil using phosphate).

7. For the lead stabilization, EPA will consider taking the lead stabilized soil and transferring to the AMCO property for use as fill material.
 8. The dilemma is whether the 8 foot depth of excavation will be sufficient? Will we be getting all of the most significantly contaminated soils out as part of the excavation effort?
 9. Purpose of the excavation is to get as much contaminant mass removed from the soil/groundwater as possible, leaving residual groundwater contamination to be treated by some other treatment technology (thermal or bioremediation). However, EPA recognizes that they need to be prudent in terms of the dollars that are going to be spent.
 10. The site-wide cleanup will be designed to meet residential standards.
- EPA will wait for input from the State (California DTSC).
 - After EPA receives comments, we will revise the internal draft FFS and produce the Public Draft FFS.
 - During first 30 days of Public Comment Period, EPA will hold a technical workshop to go over the Draft FFS.
 - Under law, EPA is required to extend the Public Comment Period an additional 30 days if requested. Hopefully, we will minimize need for the additional 30-day period if we continue to have these CAG meetings and answer questions/concerns raised by the public.

Technical Advisor Input

TA John Schweizer, Technical Advisor to the CAG

- Questions have been raised from community about cleaning up lead in the homes.
 - If you use water and soap in a bucket to wipe things down, need to change water often.
 - Better to use disposable wipes for cleaning surface.
- J. Schweizer wanted to note to the community the consistent reference to the top 65 feet as the focus for the cleanup. The base of this geologic formation is the low permeable material (Bay Mud). J. Schweizer has recommended that EPA investigate to see whether there is contamination below the Bay Mud. EPA has indicated the desire to investigate this issue.
- J. Schweizer discussed the April indoor air data for the various compounds that were detected.
 - Based on soil gas data, J. Schweizer distinguished between contaminants with source in the home vs. source from the groundwater/soil.
 - J. Schweizer talked about the recent data from 1436/1438 3rd Street. The house is constructed on slab with a very small crawl space (wood 2 x 4s placed on slab). The vacuum system pulls from soil gas from beneath the slab, possibly increasing the VOC load to the air. J. Schweizer recommended that EPA evaluate this potential increased loading.
 - J. Schweizer indicated that he has submitted a proposal to EPA regarding development of a web site that would serve as a way to provide site updates, provide his comments to the community, as well as a means for the community to ask questions.

Miscellaneous

Request for information from the Community:

1. When will EPA issue the decision on the lien on the AMCO facility property?

Next Meeting

- AMCO Superfund Site CAG Meeting: January 31 (Tuesday), 6:30 – 8:30 PM at the Mandela Gateway Apartments Community Room located at 1400 7th Street, Oakland.
- Discussion topic: The objective of the meeting will be planning related to the workshop to address the Proposed Plan – what will the workshop look like, what will be done
- AMCO Superfund Site, Proposed Plan Workshop: February 15 (Tuesday), 6:30 – 8:30 PM at the Mandela Gateway Apartments Community Room located at 1400 7th Street, Oakland.
- Note: Later a lead cleanup focused meeting was scheduled on Jan. 24, same time, same place.

Upcoming Meetings (tentative):

March 14

April 11

May 9

June 13